

### Remarks

Claims 1-12, 19-20, 22-28, 30 and 32-46 are pending in the application.

Claim 3 was objected to because of the following informalities: In lines 1-2, Applicant recites "the offset spherical or aspherical surfaces". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Applicant has corrected this insufficiency by the amendments to the claims above and requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murata (U.S. Patent No. 4,935,665).

Murata discloses an array of LEDs that each have a lens element 31 that is described as being *convex*, see col. 4, lines 29-31. Convex is defined in Webster's as being 'curved or rounded.' The reference to Figure 1 cannot be relied upon with referring to the associated description, which describes the lens as convex.

Prior to amendment, claim 1 required, "a lens having a compound shape that is distributable around the LED light source..." The lens of Murata does not have a compound shape, as the lenses are described as being convex in the specification of Murata.

Claim 1 has been further amended to clarify that the term compound refers to a lens having 'at least one curved surface and a flat surface...' Murata does not disclose such a lens as discussed above.

Applicant therefore submits that claims 1-6 are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Claims 1, and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Latz et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,603,496).

Similar to Murata, Latz teaches a lens that is rounded. As seen in Figure 3, the lens elements such as 15 are rounded. They do not have a compound shape, much less the further clarification of a compound shape having at least one rounded surface and a flat surface, as amended in claim 1.

Applicant therefore submits that claims 1 and 3-6 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Claims 7-12, 19-20, 22-28, 30 and 32-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latz, and further in view of Mize (U.S. Patent No. 6,328,456).

Claims 7-12 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the prior art for the reasons as applied to claim 1. The embodiments referenced by the office action in Mize are directed to a lens for a single LED that is designed to widen the viewing angle, as described at col. 5, lines 55-62 and col. 6, lines 13-17.

Claim 1, from which these claims depend, as amended, requires that the lens be arranged ‘to collimate the light from the LED...’ Therefore, the combination of Latz and Mize cannot teach the invention as claimed in claim 1, much less the further limitations of claims 7-12.

Claim 30 requires that each lens of the lens array have a compound shape and the light from each side of the LED is projected into a respective curved surface. As discussed above, Latz does not disclose lenses with a compound shape. Further, Latz does not receive the light from the LED but from the light pipe 14.

As discussed above, the embodiments of Mize referenced in the office action do not direct the light into the curved surfaces, but rather direct the light out the planar surfaces 32a, 32b and 32c. The surfaces are not curved, but planar, see Figure 7, col. 6, lines 4-17 of Mize.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 30 and its dependent claims 32-41 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art and request allowance of these claims.

Similarly, claim 42 requires that light be projected into a respective curved surface of the lens. As discussed above, the combination of Latz and Mize teaches away from the use of curved surfaces.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 42 and its dependent claims 19-20, 22-28 and 43-46 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of these claims.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 20575**

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

---

Julie L. Reed  
Registration No. 35,349

210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-3613